

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 6035 of 1993

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.A.MEHTA Sd/-

- =====
1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO
  2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
  3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO
  4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO
  5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates, Judge/Judges, Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

-----  
VAIBHAVIBEN NATHABHAI PATEL

Versus

GUJARAT UNIVERSITY  
-----

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 6035 of 1993  
MR HJ NANA VATI for Petitioner No. 1  
MR HARSHADRAY A.DAVE FOR MR SN SHELAT  
for Respondent No. 1  
-----

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.A.MEHTA

Date of decision: 25/06/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1 This petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is directed against the action of

respondent-Gujarat University by applying the rules for admission in Bachelor of Education Degree Course for 1993-94.

2 It appears from the averments made in the petition that the petitioner passed her B.A.Examination in the year 1992 and applied for admission to B.Ed. course on the basis of Rules for the year 1992-93 but for the course in the year 1993-94. The respondent University has granted admission on the basis of Rules applicable for 1993-94 and granted admission on the basis of having passed her B.A.Degree from Shri Lunawada Arts, Science and Commerce College, Lunawada, District Panch Mahals. The petitioner seeks admission in any one of the Colleges conducting B.Ed. Degree course in Kheda district on the basis of her domicile in the said district. Heard Mr.H.J.Nanavati, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Mr.Harshadray A.Dave for Mr.S.N.Shelat on behalf of the respondent-University.

3 Considering the nature of the controversy between the parties it is apparent that by efflux of time the same has become infructuous and as stated by Mr.Nanavati he has no instructions from the petitioner as to the developments after the petition was admitted on 14/7/1993.

4 In the circumstances, without entering into the merits of the dispute between the parties, the petition is rejected as having become infructuous by efflux of time. Rule discharged. There shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

(D.A.Mehta,J)

m.m.bhatt